

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

CEQUENT PERFORMANCE
PRODUCTS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 13-cv-15293
Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

v.

HOPKINS MANUFACTURING
CORPORATION *et al.*,

Defendants.

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL
AND FOR *IN CAMERA* REVIEW (ECF #70)**

On March 3, 2017, Plaintiff Cequent Performance Products, Inc. (“Cequent”) filed a motion to compel the production of certain documents from Defendant Hopkins Manufacturing Corporation (“Hopkins”) (the “Motion to Compel”). (*See* ECF #70.) Hopkins has withheld production of these documents on the basis of the attorney-client privilege. In the Motion to Compel, Cequent asks the Court “to review the withheld documents *in camera* to determine whether they are privileged and, if not, then order Hopkins to produce them.” (*Id.* at 2, ECF #70 at Pg. ID 2272.) Hopkins opposes production of the documents and insists that the Court can determine whether they are privileged without an *in camera* review. (*See* ECF #74.)

The Court concludes that the best course of action is to conduct an *in camera* review of the documents. Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS IN PART** the Motion to Compel to the extent it requests an *in camera* review. Hopkins shall deliver unredacted copies of the documents identified in the Motion to Compel to the Court's chambers within seven (7) days of this Order. The Court will then review the documents *in camera* and make a determination as to which documents, if any, should be produced to Cequent.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Matthew F. Leitman
MATTHEW F. LEITMAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: March 22, 2017

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on March 22, 2017, by electronic means and/or ordinary mail.

s/Holly A. Monda
Case Manager
(313) 234-5113